

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMSHID S. KASHANNEJAD,

No. C-11-2228 EMC

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER RE PLAINTIFF'S REPORT OF  
FEBRUARY 29, 2012**

UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND  
IMMIGRATION SERVICES, *et al.*,

**(Docket No. 71)**

Defendants.

---

Previously, the Court ordered Plaintiff Jamshid S. Kashannejad “to provide Defendants with the new desired date of travel and the intended carrier and port of entry by March 1, 2012.” Docket No. 70 (Order at 2). On February 29, 2012, Mr. Kashannejad filed a report in response to the Court’s order. Having reviewed that report, the Court hereby rules as follows.


1. Mr. Kashannejad has failed to comply with the Court’s order. The Court’s order required that he provide to Defendants, *inter alia*, the intended carrier -- *i.e.*, the specific carrier. *See also* Docket No. 58 (Order at 2) (stating that “Defendants have a good faith basis for wanting Mr. Kashannejad’s transportation letter to include the *specific carrier* and point of entry”) (emphasis added). In his report, Mr. Kashannejad simply states that he intends to travel by an air carrier and that he will give the name of the specific airline when he serves his itinerary on Defendants one week before his first date of travel. Mr. Kashannejad is ordered to correct this deficiency by serving on Defendants the name of the specific carrier. Service must be effected within one day of the date of this order.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

2. Mr. Kashannejad suggests in his report that Defendants’ declaration of February 23, 2012, is insufficient because it does not “detail[] how [he] will be permitted to come into the United States, nor have [Defendants] stated that TL [transportation letter] is sufficient for plaintiff’s return to the United States.” Pl.’s Rpt. at 1. The Court does not agree. The Vinet declaration states that Mr. Kashannejad’s lawful temporary resident status has been reinstated, and so “once he reports to the U.S. Consulate to pick up his transportation letter he will be allowed to fly to the United States.” Docket No. 69 (Vinet Decl. ¶ 7). In other words, because Mr. Kashannejad is a LTR, the transportation letter will be all that he needs to return to the United States.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 1, 2012

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States District Judge